



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

December 10, 2014

Mr. Brandon W. Carr  
Assistant City Attorney  
City of Fort Worth  
1000 Throckmorton Street, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor  
Fort Worth, Texas 76102

OR2014-22364

Dear Mr. Carr:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under the Public Information Act (the "Act"), chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 546749 (PIR No. W037206).

The City of Fort Worth (the "city") received a request for the following information pertaining to three named officers of the city's police department: personnel files, civil service files, disciplinary history, performance and efficiency evaluations, special assignments, internal affairs files, law enforcement training courses, off-duty jobs, and records regarding overtime and compensation received from overtime. You state the city has released a majority of the requested information to the requestor. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.122 of the Government Code.<sup>1</sup> We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

---

<sup>1</sup>We note that, although you cite section 552.108 of the Government Code, you did not submit to this office written comments supporting this exception, nor have you identified any information you seek to withhold under this exception. Therefore, we presume you no longer assert this exception. See Gov't Code §§ 552.301, .302.

Initially, we understand the city redacted motor vehicle record information pursuant to section 552.130(c) of the Government Code.<sup>2</sup> However, we note the city also redacted a date of birth. A governmental body may not withhold information from the public without asking this office for a decision under section 552.301 of the Government Code unless a provision of the Act or a previous determination specifically authorizes the governmental body to do so. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(a); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 673 (2001) (previous determinations). You do not assert, nor does our review of the records indicate, the city has been authorized to withhold a date of birth without seeking a ruling from this office. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(a); ORD 673. Therefore, information must be submitted in a manner that enables this office to determine whether the information comes within the scope of an exception to disclosure. In this instance, we can discern the nature of the redacted information; thus, being deprived of this information does not inhibit our ability to make a ruling. In the future, however, the city should refrain from redacting any information it is not authorized to withhold in seeking an open records ruling. Failure to do so may result in the presumption the redacted information is public. *See* Gov't Code § 552.302.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." *Id.* § 552.101. This section encompasses information protected by other statutes such as section 143.089 of the Local Government Code. You state the city is a civil service city under chapter 143 of the Local Government Code. Section 143.089 contemplates two different types of personnel files relating to a police officer: a police officer's civil service file that the civil service director is required to maintain, and an internal file that the police department may maintain for its own use. Local Gov't Code § 143.089(a), (g). The officer's civil service file must contain certain specified items, including commendations, periodic evaluations by the police officer's supervisor, and documents relating to any misconduct in which the department took disciplinary action against the officer under chapter 143 of the Local Government Code. *Id.* § 143.089(a).

In cases in which a police department investigates a police officer's misconduct and takes disciplinary action against an officer, it is required by section 143.089(a)(2) to place all investigatory records relating to the investigation and disciplinary action, including background documents such as complaints, witness statements, and documents of like nature from individuals who were not in a supervisory capacity, in the police officer's civil service file maintained under section 143.089(a).<sup>3</sup> *Abbott v. City of Corpus Christi*, 109

---

<sup>2</sup>Section 552.130(c) of the Government Code allows a governmental body to redact the information described in subsection 552.130(a) without the necessity of seeking a decision from the attorney general. Gov't Code § 552.130(c). If a governmental body redacts such information, it must notify the requestor in accordance with section 552.130(e). *See id.* § 552.130(d), (e).

<sup>3</sup>Chapter 143 prescribes the following types of disciplinary actions: removal, suspension, demotion, and uncompensated duty. Local Gov't Code §§ 143.051-.055; *see, e.g.*, Attorney General Opinion JC-0257 (2000) (written reprimand is not disciplinary action for purposes of Local Government Code chapter 143).

S.W.3d 113, 122 (Tex. App.—Austin 2003, no pet.). All investigatory materials in a case resulting in disciplinary action are “from the employing department” when they are held by or in possession of the police department because of its investigation into a police officer’s misconduct, and the police department must forward them to the civil service commission for placement in the civil service personnel file. *Id.* Such records may not be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 143.089 of the Local Government Code. *See* Local Gov’t Code § 143.089(f); Open Records Decision No. 562 at 6 (1990).

However, a document relating to an officer’s alleged misconduct may not be placed in his civil service personnel file if there is insufficient evidence to sustain the charge of misconduct. Local Gov’t Code § 143.089(b). In addition, a document relating to disciplinary action against a police officer that has been placed in the officer’s personnel file as provided by section 143.089(a)(2) must be removed from the officer’s file if the civil service commission finds the disciplinary action was taken without just cause or the charge of misconduct was not supported by sufficient evidence. *See id.* § 143.089(c). Information that reasonably relates to an officer’s employment relationship with the police department and that is maintained in a police department’s internal file pursuant to section 143.089(g) is confidential and must not be released. *See City of San Antonio v. San Antonio Express-News*, 47 S.W.3d 556 (Tex. App.—San Antonio 2000, pet. denied); *City of San Antonio v. Texas Attorney General*, 851 S.W.2d 946, 949 (Tex. App.—Austin 1993, writ denied).

You state Exhibit C consists of records taken from the police department’s internal files pursuant to section 143.089(g) and these records are maintained by the police department for its own use. Additionally, you explain, and the submitted information reflects, the internal affairs investigation in Exhibit C resulted in a determination the allegations were unfounded and the investigation did not result in disciplinary action. We understand none of the submitted records are contained in the police officers’ civil service files. We therefore conclude the submitted information is confidential pursuant to section 143.089(g) of the Local Government Code and must be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code.<sup>4</sup>

This letter ruling is limited to the particular information at issue in this request and limited to the facts as presented to us; therefore, this ruling must not be relied upon as a previous determination regarding any other information or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For more information concerning those rights and responsibilities, please visit our website at <http://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open/>

---

<sup>4</sup>As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure.

[orl\\_ruling\\_info.shtml](#), or call the Office of the Attorney General's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable charges for providing public information under the Act may be directed to the Office of the Attorney General, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Lindsay E. Hale". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large, looping initial "L".

Lindsay E. Hale  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

LEH/akg

Ref: ID# 546749

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)